



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

11. Miracles and belief in miracles. *Teil II. Kirchliches Leben.* 1. The church. 2. The clergy. 3. Functions of the church. 4. Hermits. 5. Martyrs. 6. Justification by good works.

The writer promises to treat secular life in Part III and then to publish the three parts as a book. The importance of such contributions to the study of the life of the Middle Ages can readily be seen. It is only through the aid of special investigations of this character that a comprehensive and accurate history of medieval life can be written.

The *Miracles* of *Notre Dame* have been already rather fully treated by Petit de Julleville in his very readable work, *Les Mystères* (Paris, 1880). An up-to-date summary of the subject by Gröber may be found in his *Grundriss der Romanischen Philologie* (II. Band, I. Abt., pp. 1204–1218) under the heading: *Marienmirakel*. Forkert's dissertation, limited to a special phase of the subject, contains much material of value. It is written in a facile and readable style. The conclusions for the most part seem sound. In the Introduction, Forkert qualifies the reliableness of the *Miracles* as a historical document reflecting the life of the time. He fully realizes that the allusions, the remote sources and the supernatural, formal and conventional elements often render the interpretation of the material difficult. We may remark, however, that the men of the Middle Ages depicted past centuries with the coloring of their own time. Forkert says (p. 4):

“Wenn die Annahme richtig ist, dass die *Miracles* ihre Entstehung oder ihre Zusammenstellung derselben Hand verdanken, was umso wahrscheinlicher dadurch wird, dass dieselben Anschauungen in derselben Einkleidung immer wiederkehren, so verringert sich ihre Bedeutung für die Kenntniss der Kultur jener Zeit noch mehr.”

Gröber (*op. cit.*, p. 1215) says:

“Auf speziellere Unterschiede und Uebereinstimmungen ist Verschiedenheit oder Gleichheit der Verfasser nicht zu gründen. Fast alle Kriterien dafür versagen. Die Benutzung z. B. derselben erfundenen Namen in verschiedenen Stücken kann auf Entlehnung beruhen, die sich der jüngere Dichter gegenüber einem älteren erlaubte. Die Anwendung desselben Rondeaux oder Rondeaufrauns in mehreren Dramen ist ebensowenig eine Anzeige desselben Verfassers.”

On page 27, Forkert says:

“Maria nennt Christus ihren Vater, ihren Sohn

und ihren Gemahl, und Christus selbst bezeichnet sich als Sohn, Bruder, Freund, Gemahl, und Vater der Maria. Mir. 8, 659–60. *Mon pere, mon fil, mon espoux.* Mir. 32, 442–43. *Qui sui de ma fille et ma mere fils, frere, ami, espoux et pere.* Dr. Schröder in seinem Buch *Glaube und Aberglaube in den Altfranzösischen Dichtungen*, S. 13, Anm. 1, erblickt darin eine Spielerei. Vielleicht lassen sich derartige Bezeichnungen als Ueberschwänglichkeiten charakterisieren, die eine Folge des übertriebenen Marienkultus sind.”

This is rather a naïve mode of expressing intimate relation and protection. Compare Homer's *Iliad*, 6, 429–30, where Andromache says to Hector at parting: “Hector, thou art my father and potent mother, yea and brother even as thou art my goodly husband.” The dissertation contains many interesting details. The misprints seem altogether too numerous in the extracts from the *Miracles*.

TIMOTHY CLORAN.

Vanderbilt University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Schillers Einfluss auf Grillparzer. Eine litterarhistorische Studie von O. E. LESSING. A Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, University of Michigan, 1901. (= *Bulletin of the University of Wisconsin*, No. 54. Philology and Literature Series, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 77–204. Madison, Wisc., 1902.)

The author of this thesis treats in a thorough manner Grillparzer's conception and opinion of Schiller and the influence of the latter upon the dramatic writings of Grillparzer. But the investigation is not yet complete, as it is limited to the dramas from *Blanka* to *Sappho*; a treatise of the others and of the lyrics being promised for the near future.

In his first chapter Dr. Lessing treats Grillparzer's personal attitude toward Schiller, using for this purpose all obtainable utterances ever made by the Austrian poet about his predecessor. Apparently it was not the author's intention to show the development of this very peculiar attitude, but rather to bring out the affinities or differences of the literary and aesthetic views of the two poets. Yet we find that Grillparzer's

views of Schiller had undergone various changes. His utterances are first full of admiration for Schiller, later, in the years of *die Ahnfrau* and *Sappho*, he shows very little appreciation for the poet of *Tell*, and only with the advance of his career he seems to comprehend the great German classic better. In order to understand these changes and to find reasons for them, Grillparzer's views in regard to Schiller, should be, first of all, considered in chronological order. The following lines will attempt to explain briefly this development.

It was at first a mere youthful enthusiasm for Schiller, which filled the soul of the young Austrian poet. Schiller is so dear to him that he recommends him to his friends and acquaintances [*Jahrb.* III, p. 108]. While writing *Blanka* and the comedy, *die Schreibfeder*, while beginning *Robert von der Normandie* and *Spartakus*, he looks upon Schiller as his model, he still considers him the only really great poet. He has given little time, so far, to Lessing and Goethe or Shakespeare, he hardly knows the Spanish poets, whom he later admires so much. But his play-writing does not meet with the success for which he longed so eagerly. This disappointment forces him to look for reasons of his failure. Schiller, the master, whom he had almost copied, could evidently not be the model whom it was worth his while to follow. He loses faith in his former master entirely, and we find our author in a struggle to gain a clear account of his attitude toward Schiller [*Jahrb.* III, pp. 130, 134]. In those days Grillparzer begins to study Goethe, whose style and artistic conception he finds entirely different and more pleasing than those of Schiller [*Jahrbuch* III, pp. 127-9]. While reading *Goetz*, *Werther*, *Faust* he shapes his own dramatic principles and forms his ideas of art more clearly. Thus the former admirer of Schiller becomes his opponent and is in his attacks so bitter that he himself feels that his opposition may be looked upon as mere partiality, 'blosse Parteilichkeit.' Only gradually does he recognize the reason for which he turns against Schiller. He feels an impulse, as he expresses it, to make his play-writing the exponent of the pure and unhidden truth and not to carry into it 'irgend etwas Lehr- oder Reflexionsmässiges.'

This is the sentiment which prevails in Grillparzer's notes and statements until 1812. Little

do we know of his development as a poet until 1816. During this time he has given up the study of law; he was tutor for about two years, a period during which his poetic endeavors are not stimulated but rather oppressed. Later he enters into the service of the Royal library and from there, soon afterwards, of the treasury department. The peculiar and rather narrow education which he had received, the death of his father, and the poverty, with all its gloom, which falls afterwards upon his family, the tiresome spirit in Count Seilern's home, his unsuccessful attempts to support his needy family—all this leaves a stamp upon his character and marks the condition of his mental mood in later years. These experiences influence most prominently the next work of his pen, *die Ahnfrau*, in 1817. This drama means to him the first success on the stage and a second one soon follows, when *Sappho* is received with great applause by large audiences of the *Burgtheater* in the following year. Both plays show a marked progress, and the fruits of eager study since the days of *Blanka*, but to no small extent do they also prove that the poet has not freed himself, as he thought, from the influence of his former ideal, Schiller. At this time, again, his criticisms of other works and authors run freely and frequently into his notes and letters, and not a few of them deal with Schiller and his theories. But all his estimates of the great classic prove that his principles have become fixed in the course of time and by the experience which he had by the recent success of his art; as Dr. Lessing says (p. 86): 'with increasing maturity his boyish hatred changes into the respect more proper to Schiller.' Nevertheless we cannot well deny that his humor, so frequently mixed with bitter satire, bursts forth here and there in almost unjust and incorrect statements about his predecessor. 'Schiller hatte in den Stücken von *Don Carlos* mehr Charakteristik entwickelt z. B. im alten Miller, Fiesco, Mohren als später;' with these words Foglar reports a remark made during a conversation (Dr. L., p. 90). There are not many, certainly, who would concur in this estimate; it seems rather to be universally admitted that *Tell* and even the *Demetrius*-fragment are superior in that respect. A similar bold statement we find in a note of 1822 (Works, vol. 18, p. 73): "Schiller's greatest mis-

take is evidently, that he too often speaks himself instead of letting his characters speak." But, naïve as he often is, he admits that he almost criticizes himself by such a remark; and therefore he adds: 'Übrigens ist darin leichter tadeln als besser, machen.' In fact he had found himself guilty of this same mistake several years before—if it is a mistake at all—when he says, 1818 (Works, vol. 18, p. 173), that *die Ahnfrau* was most effective because the sentiment, expressed in it, is in many places much more that of the poet than that of the acting characters. Still, these are only two of the few passages where he, as stated before, attacks Schiller with more or less good reason; several sound and well founded criticisms on Schiller, as made during these years, one may find well enumerated in the thesis before us.

With his next production Grillparzer seems to have left Schiller's path entirely; for the latter has very little effect upon *das goldene Vliess* which stands preëminently under the sign of the classics of antiquity. Only for the plan of the drama, as a trilogy, *Wallenstein* was surely the poet's model, and as motto for the whole plot the first page of the manuscript shows Schiller's words: 'Das eben ist der Fluch der bösen That, dass sie, fortzeugend, Böses muss gebären.'—Dr. Lessing, characterizing Grillparzer's attitude during the following years, says (p. 86): 'In seinem Urtheil wie in seinem Schaffen ist er Schiller bei aller Nacheiferung vom goldenen Vliess an unabhängig und des eignen Wertes bewusst gegenübergestanden.' Of course one cannot say that Grillparzer ever becomes again dependent upon Schiller, but as to his course in the following years, especially with his next play, *König Ottokar*, Dr. Lessing himself must admit (p. 91) that 'Grillparzer made Schiller's theories concerning the treatment of historical material entirely his own.' This shows that he clings to Schiller even after the time just named; but this term may not be sufficient. 'He returns,' says Sauer (Grillp Works, vol. i. p. 49) more graphically, 'to the dramatic technique of Schiller which he had given up more or less since the time of *die Ahnfrau*. He attains grand effects in concentration of actions, extending over long intervals of time; he is as successful in scenes showing throngs of people on the stage, as Schiller is in *Wallenstein* and *Demetrius*.' Moreover Ehrhardt, in his bi-

ography of Grillparzer, points out in several places how strong Schiller's influence has been precisely during this period of the former's historic dramas. That our poet again follows Schiller's footsteps must naturally have a different explanation from that which his former imitation needs. It is because he finds himself more than he formerly acknowledged in agreement with Schiller's views, as just mentioned concerning the treatment of historical material, or the relation of history and poetry in the drama, the conception of nature, the idealizing of characters, etc. (Thesis, p. 92). It is no longer an attitude, marked by certain prejudices, but he looks upon Schiller, since the time of *Ottokar*, as the poet, who, surpassed only by Goethe, is the highest type of a real poet and, therefore, will always be mentioned at the same time with his illustrious contemporary. He upheld Schiller's merits, especially when the 'Junge Deutschland' proclaimed with blatant clamor that it considered itself to be called to outdo Goethe and Schiller. It was meant for this 'Junge Deutschland,' when Grillparzer later, frankly said that Schiller would and should be imitated, as he is the model for every poet who still considers it worth while to follow an ideal. 'I myself was the first one,' so he continues, 'who acted according to this principle.' (Works, vol. 18, p. 53.)

But Schiller's influence did not stop with *Ottokar*, we find it also in *des Meeres und der Liebe Wellen*, a subject treated by Schiller in his ballad: *Hero and Leander*. And then, almost twenty years later, before our poet lays his pen aside, he proves once more in *Ein Bruderkwitz im Hause Habsburg*, how willing he is, even in the days of his old age, to be taught by a master like Schiller (cf. Ehrhardt, pp. 279 and 387). It is true we need not deny that we find, now and then, a line even from these later years, which proves that he does not always show the same high appreciation of Schiller. But in considering these remarks we must not forget that at this time it had become a habit with the poet, who felt himself so unjustly treated and who had therefore retired from the world into the narrow surroundings of his study, there to burst forth in the most bitter irony, by which he sought to free himself of the disgust, which he had for his time. This view must chiefly guide the interpreter of passages of the kind men-

tioned above; the context also and the reason for them should not be left out of sight, especially with regard to his fragmentary note (Works, vol. 18, p. 51): 'Schiller wurde der Lieblingsdichter des Volkes. Gewiss, weil dieses auf das Wie nicht so sehr zu achten pflegt.' Dr. Lessing regards this as a sneering remark. This it certainly is, but according to the context one may consider the sneer of the poet as chiefly directed against the public of his time that has misinterpreted not only Grillparzer, but also a poet like Schiller. As a general summary of Grillparzer's view, and as the prevailing opinion which he had of Schiller in the days of his advanced age, we may quote the words which he wrote several days before the Schiller jubilee in 1859 (Works, vol. 18, p. 75): 'Was die Feier betrifft, so kann über meine Gesinnung für Schiller kein Zweifel sein. Ich habe ihn immer durch die That geehrt, indem ich immer seinen Weg gegangen bin. Wenn ich nicht Schiller für einen grossen Dichter hielte, müsste ich mich selbst für gar keinen halten.'

This expresses in words so plain that they cannot be easily misunderstood his own attitude toward Schiller and of what great importance his noble predecessor was to him. But of what value Schiller is to the German nation as a whole, he expressed (vol. 18, p. 74) in simple but significant words when, writing in 1855 to the 'Schiller-Verein' in Leipzig, he says:

'Goethe mag ein grösserer Dichter sein und ist es wohl auch. Schiller aber ist ein grösseres Besitztum der Nation, die starke und erhebende Eindrücke braucht, Herzensbegeisterung in einer an Missbrauch des Geistes kränkelnden Zeit. Er ist nicht zum Volke herabgestiegen, sondern hat sich dahin gestellt, wo es auch dem Volke möglich wird zu ihm hinauf zu gelangen.'

In concluding this survey we may say that Grillparzer's attitude toward Schiller was not an exceptional one; though his admiration for him was not equally strong at all times, he nevertheless accords to him the rank and place that belongs to him; that is, next to Goethe. With a clear and precise judgment he approaches him; wherever he finds him, according to his conception, on the wrong path, he does not hesitate to express his disapproval; but he is equally ready to acknowledge his enormous merits and even 'to walk in his footsteps' whenever he believes that his great pre-

decessor's way was the right and the only one to follow. How far he found his own view regarding questions of dramatic technique and aesthetic doctrines in accord with those of Schiller, is distinctly brought out in the first chapter of the Thesis before us.

In his second chapter Dr. Lessing investigates Schiller's influence upon *Blanka*, and from this discussion we cannot help gaining the impression that Grillparzer has committed an obvious plagiarism. There is probably no means of justifying this action; but it may not be an idle undertaking to explain as much as possible how it could happen that Grillparzer, standing later so firmly on his own convictions, is at the outset found really copying some one else. Let us consider for a moment his mental disposition at that time. As a young, inexperienced beginner, he was spell-bound by the strong impression which Schiller's rhetorical and yet effective style made upon him. Several years later he defines that state of mind (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 129) by saying: 'I read Schiller and at the same time wrote my drama *Blanka*: and it never came into my mind to doubt its eminent excellence or my own extraordinary poetic talent; for Schiller was my idol and my model, and my feeling (perhaps rather my vanity) told me that I was well on the way toward overtaking him.' And thirty-six years later he by no means tries to conceal the mistake of his youth; for in his autobiography (Works, vol. 19, p. 38) he frankly repeats the thought of his diary: 'It took me a pretty long time to finish *Blanka* and while writing it I had always *Don Carlos* in mind.' Besides these passages we may also take into consideration those which dwell particularly on his mental disposition at that time. 'My zeal to imitate,' he says in his diary, 'surpasses all conception. All my ideas are shaping themselves according to something recently read.' It is essential that this mental habit does not remain with the poet. Eleven years later he expresses himself altogether differently about the strength of his memory. 'I am often reading without the least attention,' he says (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 143): 'and forget easily what I have read.' This weakness then becomes so apparent that he intends to aid his memory by a note-book. If we keep in mind that all these statements are diary-notes and,

therefore, not intended to be a vindication before the public, we may be permitted to form the following conclusion from these personal remarks: At the time when he wrote *Blanka*, his memory was to so great an extent the chief factor of his mental equipment, that much of what he read remained almost literally in his mind and was later reproduced wherever there was an opportunity to do so. As far as this peculiarity is concerned, our poet's case is not at all an extraordinary one. As he at that time was especially full of enthusiasm for Schiller and eagerly read his works, he adapts many ideas from him which later almost involuntarily find their way into his own writings. At the same time his mind must have worked with a certain amount of elasticity for, though he found it a difficult task to bring the plot to an appropriate outcome, he nevertheless expresses, several years later, a longing for 'that spirit which flowed in such liberal measure into his drama *Blanka*.' (*Jahrb.*, III. p. 130.) When we take his state of mind into consideration, it surely must furnish us to some degree an explanation for the great similarity between *Blanka* and *Don Carlos*.

That this resemblance extends not only to certain passages but also to the general arrangement of the plot and of the scenes, Dr. Lessing has shown very elaborately. To the many passages which he places opposite one another in order to prove Schiller's influence, I wish to add at least one, which seems to me a case of very obvious imitation. *Blanka* Act III. scene 3 and 4 can be easily compared with *Carlos* II. 11-13 in the following way; *Blanka* III. 3: Haro, Rodrigo; the plan of Fedriko's ruin is laid out.—*Carlos* II. 10 Alba, Domingo; the plan of *Carlos*' ruin is mentioned.—*Blanka* III. 4: the king, Maria, Haro, Rodrigo; Fedriko's love for Maria is discovered.—*Carlos* II. 11-13 Eboli, Domingo, Alba; *Carlos*' love for the queen is discovered.—Striking is also the way in which a change of the action is brought about in *Blanka* III. 3 and *Carlos* II. 7: 'Still, ich höre kommen,' says Eboli before the prince enters, and the same words Haro uses at the approach of the king.

But in some places of the Thesis, where Dr. Lessing sets a passage of Schiller over against one of Grillparzer, one cannot very easily see the point of comparison that is supposed to lie in such

quotations. For instance, it is stated in the Thesis (p. 109) that Blanka's description of nature (Works, vol. 10, p. 30) resembles some words of King Charles in *die Jungfrau von Orleans*. Now, Charles' admiration for the nature of the country, of which he speaks in that place, expresses itself in sensual terms and he dreams of a spot where he can escape the burdens of his royal duty and satisfy his low desires, while Blanka remembers France and the peaceful, pastoral surroundings of her home as standing in great contrast to her present environment, full of vice and treachery. In the first case the motive is the most frivolous indifference, in the second it is a longing to flee from the threatening catastrophe into the refuge of her home. One may have similar doubts concerning the quotations on page 111 and, most of all, in regard to the remark on the same page:

'Wie Thekla gegen die Gräfin Terzky so macht Blanka gegen Jaqueline das Recht der freien Herzenswahl geltend.—Weder *Thekla* noch *Blanka* fragen nach dem Stand der Geliebten; beide fühlen sich emporgehoben und beseligt durch die Liebe, die nichts sucht als Gegenliebe.'

If the passage in *Blanka* permits such an interpretation I think the first of the two ideas is so very common in literature in general that we need not necessarily trace it back to Schiller's *Wallenstein*. Still, Dr. Lessing is by no means blind to Grillparzer's own achievement and points out in various places where one can notice the poet's individual work. We must admit that Grillparzer is remarkably independent in developing his characters; with what success we can hardly discuss here; but in general the strength and the weakness of his talents as a dramaturgist are foreshadowed in this first piece of his dramatic poetry. The male characters in *Blanka* are surely not presented very happily; he cannot bring before our minds in sharp, distinct contour men like Marquis Posa, Alba, or Wallenstein. But types of women like Hero, Sappho, or Libussa show his ability in analyzing woman's character; and here in *Blanka* we find the first sign of this strength, so fully developed later. When Ehrhardt, with special regard to Maria, says (Biogr., p. 195): 'The disciple is like his master, especially unfortunate in the delineation of female characters,' he certainly does Grillparzer a great wrong. Though the poet

admits himself (Works, vol. 18, p. 166) that it was difficult for him to gain a clear conception of the character of Maria Padilla, she is nevertheless, compared with other delineations, unique and the best outlined figure of the play. As the mistress of the king, she represents thoroughly a woman of her kind. Grillparzer shows her in all the passion, and unscrupulous enterprises of that type of womanhood, thus creating scenes almost as full of dramatic fervor as some of his later plays. What relation she holds to the other persons of the cast and of what importance this is to the whole play, is graphically shown by Sauer (Grillp. Works, vol. I. p. 28).

So much for *Blanka*. In a third chapter Dr. Lessing treats the fragments of 1810-1813 and their relation to Schiller. Among other things he says about the torso *Spartacus*: 'ohne *Fiesco*, *Jungfrau von Orleans* und *Wilhelm Tell* wäre es nicht geworden, was es ist.' I think it is merely an incomplete enumeration of sources when the author omits to mention *die Räuber*. For Ehrhardt, while showing the relation between the two plays, says very truly (Biogr., p. 439): 'Grillparzer steht vollständig im Banne Schiller's und zwar des Verfassers *der Räuber*.'

One must find the beginning of Dr. Lessing's last chapter very surprising. '*Die Ahnfrau*,' so the Thesis reads (p. 186), 'verdankt ihre Entstehung weniger inneren Erfahrungen als unklaren Vorstellungen.' If one follows, for comparison, first Grillparzer's own testimony as to the disposition of his mind at that time (*Jahrb.* III. pp. 123-126; pp. 130-132), and then reads *die Ahnfrau*, he will discover in the latter all these well and clearly defined mental moods noted in the observations of the diary. Minor (*Jahrb.* IX.) and Dr. Kohm (*Jahrb.* XI.) take this fact for granted in their respective discussions. But, most of all, Grillparzer himself maintains very emphatically (Works, vol. 18, 173) that 'just these personal views and individual perceptions made his drama so effective.' Concerning the influence of Schiller upon *die Ahnfrau*, the author's view differs likewise from that of other interpreters of the drama. Verbal imitations and resemblances may not be so frequent as in *Blanka*, but a closer investigation forces one to believe that the influence is stronger than Dr.

Lessing admits. How much the poet owes, especially to *die Braut von Messina* and *die Räuber*, has been shown more than once by Minor, (*Jahrb.*, IX) Volkelt,¹ and others; it will therefore not be necessary to enter into any lengthy discussion of that question.

What Dr. Lessing expresses in a foot-note on p. 200 as his view of the value of *Sappho*, is, as he admits himself, somewhat startling, and one can only wish that he may prove his statement as soon as possible.—As said in the beginning, Dr. Lessing's interpretation of Grillparzer's dramas does not go beyond *Sappho*. The promised treatment of the whole subject will naturally furnish still more interesting material; for as every Grillparzer student will admit, the real value and profit of Schiller's influence upon the Austrian poet becomes evident only in his dramas after *Sappho*, for example, *Ottokar*, *Hero* and *Leander*, *der Bruderzwist*, and, to some extent also, in *Ein treuer Diener*.

A. BUSSE.

Cambridge, Mass.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PHONETIC RECORDS OF DIALECTS.

To the Editors of *Mod. Lang. Notes*.

SIRS:—Hardly any more important problem could be undertaken than that of collecting phonograms of the dialects of the world. All of them are rapidly changing and many are fast disappearing. They should be collected on indestructible material, such as hard rubber or celluloid, so that they can be duplicated by the thousand, used as often as desired, and traced off on paper for measurement.

Several arrangements for collecting dialects have already been made.

For America the following can be done. On proper application I can meet the person in Philadelphia and have a record made. Two matrices will be preserved, one to be deposited with me, the other at some place to be designated. These

¹ *Franz Grillparzer als Dichter des Tragischen*. Nördlingen, 1888.